



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,217	01/04/2006	Tatsuya Fukunaga	125754	1428
25944 7590 03/04/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HAM, SEUNGSOOK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2817				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,217

Applicant(s)

FUKUNAGA ET AL.

Examiner

Seungsook Ham

Art Unit

2817

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/4/08

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Species I, claims 1-4 in the reply filed on 12/10/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the entire application could be made without serious burden. This is not found persuasive because the applicant failed to establish there is no serious burden or Species are not patentably distinct. The examiner pointed out the each species contains a patentably distinct feature which includes the addition search in each species.

Claims 5-22 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Species II-V, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 12/10/07.

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 14, lines 10 and 12, there are two "fifth" embodiments.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, lines 8 and 11 "in the one E plane coupling window" and line 13, "another E plane coupling window" are vague and indefinite as to how "one E plane coupling window" and "another E plane coupling window" are related to "at least one E plane coupling window" recited in line 4 (i.e., are "one E plane coupling window" and "another E plane coupling window" are part of "at least one E plane coupling window" or a separate coupling window?).

In claim 2, lines 1 and 2, "wherein only one E plane coupling window is provided as **the** E plane coupling window" is confusing as to which E plane coupling window recited in claim 1 referring to.

In claim 3, lines 3-4, and claim 4, lines 4-5, "are provided as the E plane coupling window" are also confusing as to which E plane coupling window recited in claim 1 referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boujet (US '367, insofar as understood).

Boujet (fig1) discloses an RF module comprising: a waveguide in which a half-wavelength TE mode resonator 5 is formed (col. 1, lines 10-15); at least one E plane coupling window/only one E plane coupling window (in claim 2) 19 formed in a wall portion orthogonal to an H plane out of wall portions constructing the TE mode resonator in the waveguide; one output line 2 (the top conductive wall) provided at the edge on the side of one of the wall portions 9 (the top wall) parallel with the H plane in the one E plane coupling window and magnetically coupled to electromagnetic waves in the TE mode resonator; and another output line 2 (the bottom conductive wall) provided at the edge on the side of the other wall portion 9 (the bottom wall) parallel with the H plane in the one E plane coupling window and magnetically coupled to the electromagnetic waves.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Itoh et al. (US 560) discloses a dielectric waveguide resonator coupled to a microstrip line; and

Ralph (figs. 3 and 4) discloses a balanced output line structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seungsook Ham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2405. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal can be reached on (571)-272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Seungsook Ham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2817

/Seungsook Ham/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2817